



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,369	12/20/2001	David L. Henty	DLHLPAU.03	9652

7590 06/11/2009  
David L. Henty  
Suite 1150  
19900 MacArthur Blvd.  
Irvine, CA 92612

EXAMINER
----------

KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/11/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

The following office action is in response to the request for reconsideration, filed on March 9, 2009. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-24 are pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-4, 6, 8-14, 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien (US 6,441,804) in view of Klein (US 6,259,367).

As to independent claim 1, Hsien discloses a wireless mouse (col. 2, lines 65, Fig. 1, item 24, wireless cursor pointing device, shown to be a wireless mouse in col. 3, lines 5-8) and reader combination (Fig. 1, item 34, col. 3, lines 1-4), comprising: a source of an interrogating field (Fig. 1, the distance between 24 and 34); a wireless mouse having a mouse motion encoder (col. 3, lines 12-24, shown by the x-axis (40) and y-axis (44) position generators, for generating positions of the mouse), an antenna (90), and an RF circuit (transmitter circuit 28 with an RF amplifier (82)) coupled to the antenna (col. 3, lines 44-61) and associated with the motion encoder and providing a RF signal identifying mouse motion (col. 3, lines 44-61) ; and a reader (34) including a decoder (164, demodulation circuit) for receiving RF signals from the wireless mouse (col. 7, lines 27-55) and detecting the data sent from the RF tag passive transponder circuit (col. 7, lines 27-55) and the mouse motion information from the mouse RF circuit (col. 7,

Art Unit: 2629

lines 15-20, where the reader receives signals from the transmitter in the wireless mouse about motion).

Hsien does not disclose wherein the wireless mouse and reader combination is adapted for use with a separate independently movable RFID tag, the tag having data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit, and wherein the reader receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag.

Klein teaches an electronic computer system comprising a reader for use with a separately independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, lines 51-60). The RFID tag has data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit (col. 2, line 61-col. 3, line 7), and wherein the reader receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the RFID tagged products to be read as shown by Klein into the system of Hsien as the RFID tagging facilitates locating and/or retrieving of objects by radio frequency (Klein col. 3, lines 44-49).

Hsien and Klein do not explicitly teach wherein said reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and wireless mouse. However as the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc teaches, the elements of a reader with an antenna, an RFID tag and a wireless mouse, in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation; see MPEP 2141. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and the wireless mouse, as a shared antenna prevents redundancy and reduces the number of components.

As to independent claim 10, Hsien discloses a wireless keyboard (col. 2, lines 65, Fig. 1, item 24, wireless cursor pointing device, shown to be a wireless keyboard in col. 3, lines 5-8) and reader combination (Fig. 1, item 34, col. 3, lines 1-4), comprising: a source of an interrogating field (Fig. 1, the distance between 24 and 34); a wireless keyboard having a plurality of keys, an antenna(90), and an RF circuit (transmitter circuit 28 with an RF amplifier (82)) coupled to the antenna (col. 3, lines 44-61) and providing a RF signal identifying key activation (col. 3, lines 44-61) ; and a reader (34) including a decoder (164, demodulation circuit) for receiving RF signals from the wireless keyboard (col. 7, lines 27-55) and detecting the data sent from the RF tag passive transponder circuit (col. 7, lines 27-55) and the key activation information from the keyboard RF circuit (col. 7, lines 15-20, where the reader receives signals from the transmitter in the wireless keyboard activation); although the embodiment is shown to be a wireless cursor pointing device with the example of a wireless mouse, Hsien discloses in col. 3, lines 5-8 where it is well known in the art to use a wireless keyboard with the same system and would be the same type of signals transmitted and received.

Hsien does not disclose wherein the wireless mouse and reader combination is adapted for use with a separate independently movable RFID tag, the tag having data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit, and wherein the reader receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag.

Klein teaches an electronic computer system comprising a reader for use with a separately independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, lines 51-60). The RFID tag has data stored therein and a passive transponder circuit (col. 2, line 61-col. 3, line 7), and wherein the reader

Art Unit: 2629

receives RF signals from the separate and independently movable RFID tag (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the RFID tagged products to be read as shown by Klein into the system of Hsien as the RFID tagging facilitates locating and/or retrieving of objects by radio frequency (Klein col. 3, lines 44-49).

Hsien and Klein do not explicitly teach wherein said reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and wireless mouse. However as the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc teaches, the elements of a reader with an antenna, an RFID tag and a wireless mouse, in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation; see MPEP 2141. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and the wireless mouse, as a shared antenna prevents redundancy and reduces the number of components.

As to dependent claims 2 and 11, limitations of claims 1 and 10, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein said RFID tag is attached to a product and wherein the data stored in said RFID tag comprises product related information (col. 4, lines 19-26).

As to dependent claims 3 and 12, limitations of claims 1 and 10, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein said RFID tag is attached to a smart card and wherein the data stored in said RFID tag comprises financial information (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 6, lines 59-65)

As to dependent claims 4 and 13, limitations of claims 1 and 10, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein the data stored in said RFID tag comprises internet address location information (col. 3, lines 3-11).

As to dependent claim 6, limitations of claim 1, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said reader detects first and second RF frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected) and wherein said RFID tag transponder circuit and mouse RF circuit are operative at said first and second frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55), respectively.

As to dependent claims 8 and 16, limitations of claims 7 and 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said source of an interrogating field comprises said reader antenna (150, col. 7, lines 15-20).

As to dependent claim 9, limitations of claim 1, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said mouse RF circuit comprises one or more passive transponder circuits responsive to said interrogating field (col. 7, lines 15-55).

As to dependent claim 14, limitations of claim 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said reader detects first and second RF frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected) and wherein said RFID tag transponder circuit and said keyboard RF circuit are operative at said first and second frequencies (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected), respectively.

As to dependent claim 17, limitations of claim 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said keyboard RF circuit comprises one or more passive transponder circuits responsive to said interrogating field (col. 7, lines 15-55).

As to dependent claim 18, limitations of claim 10, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein said reader detects the data sent from the RFID tag passive transponder circuit and the key activation information from the keyboard RF circuit, during first and second time slots (col. 7, lines 15-55, multiple RF frequencies can be detected), respectively.

As to independent claim 19, limitations of claims 1 and 10, and further comprising, Hsien teaches a computer system (Fig. 1, item 10) comprising; a processor (personal computer, item 18, a processor while not explicitly stated, is inherent to a computer). Hsien fails to teach where the computer system comprises a monitor. Klein teaches a computer system (Fig. 32), comprising a monitor for displaying information (col. 3, lines 7-10, wherein a web browser is launched on a monitor). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the monitor as taught by Klein into the computer system of Hsien as the monitor enables users to view information (Klein, col. 3, lines 7-10).

Hsien and Klein do not explicitly teach wherein said reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and wireless mouse. However as the KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc teaches, the elements of a reader with an antenna, an RFID tag and a wireless mouse, in combination did no more than they would in separate, sequential operation; see MPEP 2141. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the reader comprises a shared antenna for receiving RF signals from both the RFID tag and the wireless mouse, as a shared antenna prevents redundancy and reduces the number of components.

As to independent claim 20, is a method claim of claims 1 and 10, thus is rejected in the same manner.

As to dependent claim 21, limitations of claim 19, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein the wireless manual input device is a keyboard or a mouse (col. 3, lines 5-8); Klein teaches wherein the RFID tag contains security data for access to the computer system (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7, col. 6, lines 59-65).



As to dependent claim 22, limitations of claim 20, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein the wireless manual input device is a keyboard or mouse (col. 3, lines 5-8); Klein teaches wherein the reader is configured in the computer system (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7).

As to dependent claim 23, limitations of claim 22, further comprising, Klein teaches wherein the RFID tag contains security data for access to the computer system (col. 2, line 51-col. 3, line 7, col. 6, lines 59-65).

As to dependent claim 24, limitations of claim 20, further comprising, Hsien teaches wherein the second RF field is a second modulated return field (col. 7, lines 15-55).

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsien in view of Klein as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Liu et al (6,445,379).

As to dependent claim 5, limitations of claim 1, further comprising, Hsien as modified by Klein do not wherein said motion encoder comprises a ball adapted to rotate in response to mouse motion and X and Y encoder wheels coupled to the ball so as to respectively rotate in response to mouse motion in perpendicular directions and wherein said XY encoder wheels further comprise a circuit element coupled to said RF circuit so as to tune and detune said RF circuit in response to mouse motion in X and Y directions

Liu et al teach a wireless mouse wherein said motion encoder comprises a ball (Fig. 1, item 23, col. 2, lines 32-37) adapted to rotate in response to mouse motion (col. 2, lines 32-37) and X and Y encoder wheels (Fig. 1, shown by wheels, one in the x-axis and one in the y-axis) coupled to the ball so as to respectively rotate in response to mouse motion in perpendicular directions (Fig. 1) and wherein said XY encoder wheels further comprise a circuit element coupled to said RF circuit so as to tune and detune said RF circuit in response to mouse motion

Art Unit: 2629

in X and Y directions (col. 2, lines 32-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the inner workings of the wireless mouse as shown by Liu et al into the system of Hsien as modified by Klein, as the system of Hsien as modified by Klein teach a wireless mouse but does not disclose the internal circuitry. The wireless mouse of Liu et al is advantageous as it is practical and has a low malfunction rate is lightweight as disclosed by Liu et al in col. 1, lines 7-12).

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed March 9, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that KSR is misapplied to the claims and that the rationale requires no change in function. Applicant further argued that the two prior art systems cannot be combined into the claimed structure with no change in their functions due to the functional incompatibility of the capacitive system of Klein and the conventional RF antenna of Hsien. Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. The prior art of Klein and Hsien are compatible as they both employ the RFID technology which would be readable by the RF antenna. As noted in the previous rejection, the elements of the wireless mouse, RFID tag and reader in combination did no more than they would in a separate sequential operation. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the reader would employ a shared antenna to avoid redundancy and to reduce the number of components within the system. Therefore the rejection is maintained and made FINAL.

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SRILAKSHMI K. KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-7769. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Lefkowitz can be reached on 571 272 3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Srilakshmi K Kumar/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2629

SKK  
June 3, 2009